

Contributions and Comments.

'Jew,' 'Jewry.'

IN reply to one of Professor Nestle's questions, the *New English Dictionary* dates its first reference to the word 'Jew' (Gyv), c. 1275, and tells us that the English word was adopted from the old French *giu, gyu, giue*, earlier *juteu, juiu, jueu*. The *d* does not appear to have been dropped by the Latin.

J. A. CROSS.

Leeds.

'Emmaus' Mistaken for a Person.

MR. A. SOUTER, in the note thus inscribed in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for June, is right, so far as my knowledge goes, that there is no trace of this mistake 'in any Greek manuscript.' But he ought to have added that this mistake was possible, and probably occasioned, by the reading *ὄνομα* in the Greek Codex D for ἡ ὄνομα of the rest of the MSS. Compare my *Introduction to the Textual Criticism*, p. 121 f., where I discuss these Greek and Latin readings.

EB. NESTLE.

Maulbronn.

The Rivers of Damascus.

AS I am on a visit to this place, I have been looking over my paper in the February number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, and notice two or three things that require correction. Firstly, 'Ain Funiuk' ought to be 'Ain Barada'; the former spring is higher up the valley, and most of its waters are used up in the plain of Zebedani. Secondly, for *east*, on p. 216, under the headings Nahr Kanawat and Nahr Banias, read *south*; and for *western*, under heading Taura, p. 217, read *northern*. Thirdly, *Daiwané* ought to be *Dairané*, and *Mezzaweh* ought to be *Mezzawé*.

E. W. G. MASTERMAN.

Damascus, April 1902.

The Locus Classicus for the Incarnation overlooked.

STUDENTS of the New Testament cannot have failed to observe that Christology in the Gospels

presents two different aspects of development. Whereas the Synoptists start from *below*, regarding Jesus as a man, and follow Him through the successive stages of His life up to His rise to heavenly glory and full divinity, the Fourth Gospel seems to start from *above*, by representing Jesus as a Divine Being possessing and manifesting, at the very outset, all the fulness of God. In the Synoptists Christ is regarded as a man in whom God, or the spirit of God, dwells, and who, after His probation on earth, is raised by God to heavenly glory; in the Fourth Gospel He is regarded as a heavenly Spiritual Being, the highest after God, who has assumed flesh, and who after His work on earth returns to heaven.¹ It is this latter aspect of the Incarnation that will form the subject of the present paper, my object being to examine the doctrine and adduce what I believe is a new and important passage hitherto overlooked.

The doctrine of the Incarnation is indeed implied through the whole of the Fourth Gospel (cf. especially 1¹⁸ 3^{13f.} 6^{33.} 50^{f.} 58. 6²), which represents Jesus as dwelling on earth in the shape of a human being labouring under hunger (4^{8.} 3¹), thirst (4^{7.} 9 19²⁸), fatigue (4⁶), grief (11³⁵), fear (12²⁷), hesitation (7⁸), etc.; but the *act* of His Incarnation, *i.e.* the *act* by which the spiritual Christ *became* a man, is believed to underlie 1¹⁴ 'and the Word became flesh' (καὶ ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο), where the term *Word* is alleged to be identical with that contained in the opening sentence of the Gospel (1¹): 'In the beginning was the *Word*, and the *Word* was with God, and was God.' Again, the spiritual pre-existence or pre-incarnate state of Christ is not explicitly stated, but we are left to infer it from certain passages (*e.g.* 1^{1f.} 18 3^{13.} 31^{f.} 6^{33.} 38. 42. 46. 50-51. 58. 6² 16²³ 17⁵) which, in some cases, defy grammar and sense (cf. 17^{5.} 24). It is this pre-incarnate existence of Christ and the act of His Incarnation that we have to investigate here.

In a previous article published in the *Zeitschrift für neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* (February 1901)—of which article THE EXPOSITORY TIMES gave a summary and a review in last March and December respectively—I have shown that the Logos in the opening sentences of the Fourth Gospel does not

¹ So Harnack, in his *History of Dogma*, p. 188 f., summarized by James Orr, *The Progress of Dogma*, p. 76.

mean the Incarnate Word or the Son of God, but that it echoes the cosmogonic word which God, after creating heaven and earth, uttered in calling the world into existence. I further showed that the language employed in the Prologue of the Fourth Gospel has no direct bearing on Philo's parallel language, but that both he and the evangelist had in view the same historic event, the well-known account of cosmogony recorded in the Book of Genesis. I further pointed out that the unmistakable coincidence in the language used by the evangelist and Philo respectively was due to the identity of the subject, and that while Philo is concerned especially or exclusively with the whole account of Genesis, discoursing, commenting, and speculating upon it in the interest of his race, the evangelist, being little concerned with Jewish beliefs and institutions, considers only the opening verses of Genesis as a historic event well known to his readers, and utilizes it as a suitable and appropriate introduction to his subject.

Now there are three ways of reporting a story or a well-known event. We may reproduce it faithfully, taking it in a *literal sense*, without passing critical comments upon it: this is the case with the writer of the Book of Genesis;—then we may interpret the story in a *speculative* or *allegoric sense*, a method very popular in Greco-Roman times, especially among Neoplatonic and Judæo-Alexandrine philosophers: this is the case with Philo, the trained Jewish philosopher;—then, again, we may interpret the story in a godly spirit or in a *spiritual* and *ethical sense*: this is the case with the writer of the Fourth Gospel, who interprets the subject of cosmogony in a *spiritual* sense, and so attaches a spiritual and ethical meaning to the language of the story. Hence the words *λόγος*, *πάντα* (*κόσμος*), *ζωή*, *φῶς*, *σκοτία*, found in the exordium, then *ἄρτος*, *τροφή*, *ἕδωρ*, *πατήρ*, *υἱός*, *ἀγάπη*, *ναός*, and many other terms constantly recurring in the Gospel, are used in a *spiritual* or *metaphoric* sense. It is in this spiritual principle, then, that we must approach the Prologue and try to disclose its true purport. Before doing so, however, it will be expedient and necessary to clear up two points which otherwise would impede our investigation.

Though accepting the Old Testament 'Scripture' in a sense, our evangelist does not exhibit a thorough knowledge of its contents. He even regards the system, on the whole, especially as in-

terpreted by the Jews, as a fallacy. Accordingly, when he quotes the Old Testament Scripture, he does so either to strengthen some particular argument of his, such as the Messiahship of Christ (cf. 1⁴⁶ 2¹⁶ 3¹⁴ 5^{39f.} 7³⁷ 12^{37f.} 13¹⁸); or in order to correct or even disprove it, as in cases referring to Moses (e.g. 1¹⁷ 6³² 7^{22f.}).

The other point requiring elucidation is of a grammatical nature, and refers to 1⁶, that is, to the first instance introducing the account about John the Baptist. 'There was (R.V. came) a man sent from God; his name was John.' The Greek text in all editions, both common and critical, give the reading *ἐγένετο ἄνθρωπος, ἀπεσταλμένος παρὰ θεοῦ ὄνομα αὐτῷ Ἰωάν(ν)ης*. True, one of our leading uncial codices, D*, for *θεοῦ* reads *κυρίου*, but, even if adopted, this reading would not materially affect the sense. On the other hand, N* D*, our leading authorities of the so-called Western δ-text, as well as Irenæus, after *θεοῦ* (D* *κυρίου*) insert *ἦν*, which is very important, especially if considered in its bearing on the context. For in the first place the words *παρὰ θεοῦ* undoubtedly belong not to *ἐγένετο*, so as to mean 'there was or came from God,' a construction unanimously rejected by editors and critics; it belongs to *ἀπεσταλμένος*, 'sent from God.' Again, all critics are agreed that *ἀπεσταλμένος* does not depend upon *ἐγένετο*, serving as its predicative complement,¹ but that it stands by itself. Moreover, this participle of *ἀποστέλλω* presents two points of interest for us, in that *ἀποστέλλω* is more formal, 'to despatch, mission, delegate,' than *πέμπω* 'to send'; and then that the participle *ἀπεσταλμένος* acts like a *noun*, denoting 'a delegate,' 'an envoy,' 'an ambassador' (1²⁴ 3²⁸ 9⁷ (cf. 5³⁶), Mt 23³⁷, Lk 13³⁴ 19⁸², Ac 10¹⁷ 11¹¹). This being so, *ἀπεσταλμένος παρὰ θεοῦ* means 'an envoy from God.' As to the other two words preceding, they remain isolated, and so give rise to doubts as to their real purport and function in the context. Now it is manifest that *ἄνθρωπος* cannot be mistaken, for it always means *homo*, 'a human being,' 'a person,' 'a man,' often with the connotation of insignificance: 'somebody'; but the case of *ἐγένετο* is very different. True, the A.V. renders it by

¹ Such a combination, *ἐγένετο ἀπεσταλμένος*, which would mean 'a man became an envoy or delegate,' and so could not be equivalent to *ἀπεστάλη*, as Chrysostom wishes it to be taken, has no parallel (3²⁸, Rev 16¹⁰ are irrelevant); hence editors and expositors are unanimous in dissociating *ἀπεσταλμένος* from *ἐγένετο*.

'was,' but this 'was' is a mistranslation of the *fuit* of the Latin versions, and corresponds to an ἦν, *erat*, but not to ἐγένετο, which means *fuit* and *factus est*. As to the rendering 'came' of the R.V.,¹ it is inadmissible, seeing that γίνομαι in this sense ('to come,' 'to arise,' 'to appear') should be followed by an adverbial complement denoting the *place* 'where' or 'whence,' as ἐγένετο ἐγγύς, μακράν, ἐν, εἰς, ἐπί, κατά, πρὸς, ἐκ, ἀπό.² Nor could we maintain for a moment that ἐγένετο here stands for συνέβη: 'a man came to pass, happened, occurred.' So there remains only the alternative of taking the word in the sense of *factus est*, *became*, *was made*, its commonest and most natural meaning. But 'who became' and 'what became he'? Now we readily see that in the two words ἐγένετο ἄνθρωπος the nominative ἄνθρωπος cannot be the subject, since in that case ἐγένετο would have ἀπεσταλμένος for its predicate, a construction which, as we have already seen, is unanimously and justly rejected by all editors and critics. The only alternative left, then, is to read ἐγένετο ἄνθρωπος as meaning 'became a man.' But who or what is it that 'became a man'?

Let us examine more closely the preceding account and language of the Prologue, always bearing in mind the principle of spiritual interpretation upon which the evangelist goes. Here we are told that God's Word—*itself* God—was the original author of all things, that it created the Life and the Light of mankind, but that darkness having failed to understand that Light . . . *it became a man*: Yes, the Light became a Man (*ἄνθρωπος*),—evidently to interpret or reveal the true Life and Light, that divine or 'spiritual' creation which darkness or ignorance had failed to comprehend. But in order to make sure of our interpretation let us read the Greek text, and let us at the same time emancipate ourselves from the current punctuation and verse division which editors have introduced as a means of convenience, though in very many cases also as a means of confusion.

Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος, καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεὸν καὶ θεὸς ἦν. ὁ λόγος οὗτος ἦν ἐν ἀρχῇ πρὸς τὸν θεόν. πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ

¹ In this rendering of ἐγένετο by *came*, the Revisers were apparently misled by the succeeding οὗτος ἦλθεν; but this ἦλθεν obviously refers to ἀπεσταλμένος: having been *sent*, he *came*.

² Lk 1^b: ἐγένετο ἄνθρωπος . . . ἐξ ἐφημερίας Ἀβία, is irrelevant.

ἐν. ὁ γέγονεν ἐν αὐτῷ,³ ζωὴ ἦν, καὶ ἡ ζωὴ ἦν τὸ φῶς τῶν ἀνθρώπων. καὶ τὸ φῶς ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ φαίνει, καὶ ἡ σκοτία αὐτὸ³ οὐ κατέλαβεν; ἐγένετο ἄνθρωπος.

Ἀπεσταλμένος παρὰ θεοῦ ἦν⁴ ὄνομα αὐτῷ Ἰωάννης.
'In the beginning was the Word (i.e. the cosmogonic oracle which God uttered in creating the world), and that Word was with God and so was a God (i.e. itself of the nature of God). It was this Word (i.e. not the literal word as recorded and understood in the O.T., but the divine or spiritual Word) that was in the beginning with God. All things (i.e. the world in a spiritual sense, cf. v.¹⁰) came into being through it (i.e. through the divine Word), and without it not a thing came into being. That which came into being thereby (i.e. whatsoever was created by the said Word)⁵ was (not matter, but) Life, and this Life was the Light of men. Now is the Light shining in the darkness, and hath darkness failed to apprehend it?⁶ it became a man.

'There was an envoy from God; his name was John.'

If this interpretation and exposition of the Prologue reflect the true meaning and purport of the evangelist, many new points come to light and deserve consideration. Thus (a) the opening λόγος appears once more, beyond all reasonable doubt, to echo the well-known oracular word which, according to Gn 1^{3ff}, God uttered (nine times) in creating the world; if this λόγος referred to the Person of Christ as the pre-existent Son of God, the evangelist would have used the term υἱός.

(b) V.² ὁ λόγος οὗτος ἦν ἐν ἀρχῇ πρὸς τὸν θεόν is not, as commonly and conveniently assumed, a tautology, nor an emphatic repetition of v.¹, nor a combination of the two sentences contained in

³ Codex H has αὐτον, similarly the Latin *e g* (lucem) *eam*; so, further, Theodoti excerpta, § 8 (*ap. Clem. Alex. 969*): καὶ ἡ σκοτία αὐτὸν οὐ κατέλαβεν, then Clem. Alex. *Paed.* i. 6, 28 (p. 115): καὶ τὸ σκότος αὐτὸν οὐ καταλαμβάνει, and ii. 9, 78 (p. 218): καὶ ἡ σκοτία αὐτὸν οὐ καταλαμβάνει (but not ii. 10, 99 [p. 229]: καὶ ἡ σκοτία, φησὶν, αὐτὸ οὐ καταλαμβάνει); then Ephraem Syr. 5: et hac lux in tenebris lucebat, et tenebrae *eam* non vicerunt.

⁴ So with N* D* and Irenæus.

⁵ Here ἐν αὐτῷ belongs to the preceding γέγονεν, not to the following words; the latter construction would imply that 'whatsoever was created contained life,' but the author insists on the λόγος as the creative agent.

⁶ Question and answer, a mode of discourse and narrative very favourite with the evangelist, as may be seen throughout the Gospel, and will be more amply illustrated in my forthcoming edition of *St. John's Gospel and Epistles*.

v.¹; it is a pointed allusion to Gn 1^{3ff.}, that is, to its literal and earthly interpretation, and so serves to correct that misinterpretation, on the part of the Jews, by emphasizing the *spiritual nature* of the divine Word in question.

(c) The spiritual *Life and Light*, having been misapprehended (οὐ κατέλαβεν) by darkness or ignorant mankind, assumed the shape of a man in order to interpret or reveal to men the true meaning of God's word or doctrine.

(d) The *locus classicus* for the Incarnation, especially for the *act* of the Incarnation, is contained in the Prologue 1⁵ ἐγένετο ἄνθρωπος. Cp. Phil 2⁷ ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος καὶ σχήματι ἐρέθεις ὡς ἄνθρωπος.

(e) As to 1¹⁴ καὶ ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο, 'and the Word became (or was made) flesh,' I still maintain that it has no connexion with the opening λόγος in 1¹, but that it refers to the immediately preceding ἐξουσία, to the *authority* or *mandate* given to those who had received Him (*i.e.* to His disciples) to become (dutiful) children, *i.e.* servants or

apostles on behalf of those who had believed in Him, so that the passage alludes to the *mission* received by the apostles (20²¹; cp. 17¹⁸). Hence it is not the λόγος but the *Life* or *Light* that became man. This being so, the passage 1¹⁴ καὶ ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο does not refer to the *act* of the Incarnation of the Son of God, (1) because the Incarnation is already implied in 1^{9f.} 'the true light which lighteth every man, as it cometh into the world, was (*i.e.* had been) in the word, yea, the world had been made by Him, albeit the world knew Him not'; (2) because neither Jesus ever assumes the title λόγος, nor does the evangelist ever designate Him by that epithet; (3) because, even assuming that the λόγος meant the 'Son of God,' it would be strange indeed that He who is and calls Himself the *Life* (ἡ ζωή, 6³⁵ 14⁶; cp. 1⁴, Col 3⁴) should enter the world not as living ἄνθρωπος but as σὰρξ, as 'lifeless flesh,' that very 'flesh' which He so often and so strongly decries.

A. N. JANNARIS.

Inter Alia.

THE theft of the leaf of the great Sinaitic Palimpsest, made public in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES last month, has necessarily attracted wide attention. Some time must elapse before the fact can become known everywhere. It is interesting, however, to know that by the natural circulation of the magazine the news will be carried throughout the world. Mrs. Lewis says that she sent word of the theft to us, because she found that THE EXPOSITORY TIMES was read, not only on the continent of Europe, but even in the East. She came upon two Dominican monks at Sinai itself who were reading it.

Mr. Box hopes that, when the English translation of Dalman's *Die Worte Jesu* appears, the present scandalous neglect of Jewish antiquities will cease. Well, the translation has been published. It is made by Professor Kay, recently appointed to the Chair of Hebrew in St. Andrews. It is published by Messrs. T. & T. Clark (*The Words of Jesus*, 7s. 6d. net). It comes too late for review this month, but it is a book that has not to wait on the opinion of reviewers.

Another great book comes too late this month. It is Fairbairn's *Philosophy of the Christian*

Religion (Hodder & Stoughton). It is not to be dealt with as Dalman. Reference must be quotation. The words belong to the thought. And quotation is impossible. Every thought belongs to the whole argument. We shall do our best with it, but there is only one review that will serve any good purpose, the review that sends its readers to the book.

One of the reviewers of the fourth volume of the *Dictionary of the Bible* includes Professor Max Müller among the authors who have died since the work began. But there were two Max Müllers. The Max Müller of the *Chips* is dead. But Max Müller of Philadelphia, the author of *Asien und Europa*, the great authority on Eastern Geography, is happily with us still. The Max Müller who is dead wrote nothing in the *Dictionary of the Bible*. That was not his line.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, St. Cyrus, Montrose.